

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/503,482	02/14/2000	Yoshinori Takahashi	35.G1872D	6662
5514 7	7590 05/20/2003			
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO			EXAMINER	
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA NEW YORK, NY 10112			GARCIA, GABRIEL I	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2624	/6
			DATE MAILED: 05/20/2003	·

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

.uu

•		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		1 ' ' 1	Takahash:
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
		H. Harc	
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears	on the cover sheet win	th the correspondence address
Perioa :	for Reply ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET	H	-
THE N	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	TO EXPIRE INVE	MONTH(S) FROM .
- Extens	ions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In date of this communication.	ı no event, however, may a rep	ly be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the
- If the p	period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within t	he statutory minimum of thirty	(30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO p	period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause t	and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS the application to become ABAN	S from the mailing date of this communication.
- Any re	ply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	this communication, even if tim	ely filed, may reduce any
Status		ı	
_	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 215/	03	
2a) 🔀	This action is FINAL . 2b) This act	tion is non-final.	
3) 🗌	Since this application is in condition for allowance	except for formal mat	tters, prosecution as to the merits is
Dienosii	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex pation of Claims	rte Quayle, 1935 C.E). 11; 453 O.G. 213.
	Claim(s) 45,46,48,49 and 51-1	/ ₋ ~	
	a) Of the above, claim(s)Claim(s)		
	Claim(s) 45,46,48,49 and 51-65		
7) ∐	Claim(s)		ic/ara abicated to
	Claim(s)		is/are objected to.
8) 🗆	Claims		ct to restriction and/or election requirement.
8) 🗌 Applica	Claimstion Papers		
8)	Claimstion Papers The specification is objected to by the Examiner.	are subjec	ct to restriction and/or election requirement.
8) 🗌 Applica	Claimstion Papers The specification is objected to by the Examiner. The drawing(s) filed onis/are	are subject are subject are all accepted or b	ct to restriction and/or election requirement.
8)	Claims tion Papers The specification is objected to by the Examiner. The drawing(s) filed on is/are Applicant may not request that any objection to the design of the design	are subject a) □ accepted or becoming(s) be held in ab	ot to restriction and/or election requirement. O) objected to by the Examiner. Devance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
8)	Claims tion Papers The specification is objected to by the Examiner. The drawing(s) filed on is/are Applicant may not request that any objection to the d The proposed drawing correction filed on	are subject a) □ accepted or becoming(s) be held in abcoming:	ct to restriction and/or election requirement.
8)	Claims tion Papers The specification is objected to by the Examiner. The drawing(s) filed on is/are Applicant may not request that any objection to the d The proposed drawing correction filed on If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to	are subject e a) □ accepted or becoming(s) be held in abcoming: a) □ to this Office action.	ot to restriction and/or election requirement. O) objected to by the Examiner. Devance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
8)	Claims tion Papers The specification is objected to by the Examiner. The drawing(s) filed on is/are Applicant may not request that any objection to the d The proposed drawing correction filed on If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examination is objected.	are subject e a) □ accepted or becoming(s) be held in abcoming: a) □ to this Office action.	ot to restriction and/or election requirement. O) objected to by the Examiner. Devance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
8)	Claims tion Papers The specification is objected to by the Examiner. The drawing(s) filed on is/are Applicant may not request that any objection to the d The proposed drawing correction filed on If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examinunder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120	are subject e a) □ accepted or bect drawing(s) be held in ab is: a) □ to this Office action. iner.	ct to restriction and/or election requirement. a) objected to by the Examiner. beyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
8)	Claims tion Papers The specification is objected to by the Examiner. The drawing(s) filed on is/are Applicant may not request that any objection to the d The proposed drawing correction filed on If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examination of the control of the con	are subject e a) □ accepted or bect drawing(s) be held in ab is: a) □ to this Office action. iner.	ct to restriction and/or election requirement. a) objected to by the Examiner. beyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
8)	Claims tion Papers The specification is objected to by the Examiner. The drawing(s) filed on is/are Applicant may not request that any objection to the d The proposed drawing correction filed on If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examination and the companion of the compa	are subject a a) accepted or becoming (s) be held in abtering is: a) to this Office action. tionity under 35 U.S.C.	ct to restriction and/or election requirement. a) objected to by the Examiner. beyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
8)	Claims tion Papers The specification is objected to by the Examiner. The drawing(s) filed on is/are Applicant may not request that any objection to the d The proposed drawing correction filed on If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examination and the companion of the proposed drawings are required in reply to the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examination and the companion of the companion of the priority documents have the companion of the priority document	are subject a a) accepted or bect and accepted in abcepted in abcepted in abcepted in abcepted in accepted in acc	ct to restriction and/or election requirement. a) objected to by the Examiner. beyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). approved b) disapproved by the Examiner. C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
8)	Claims tion Papers The specification is objected to by the Examiner. The drawing(s) filed on is/are Applicant may not request that any objection to the d The proposed drawing correction filed on If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examination and the companion of the proposed drawings are required in reply to the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examination and the companion of the companion of the companion of the priority documents have the companion of the priority documents have companion of the priori	are subject and accepted or becoming a large subject and accepted or becoming a large subject and accepted or become accepted in Application and accepted are subject and accepted	ct to restriction and/or election requirement. a) objected to by the Examiner. beyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). approved b) disapproved by the Examiner. c. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
8)	Claims tion Papers The specification is objected to by the Examiner. The drawing(s) filed on	are subject and accepted or become accepted or become accepted in about the desired accepted are subjected are subjected. The been received are been received in Approximents have been au (PCT Rule 17.2(a))	ct to restriction and/or election requirement. a) objected to by the Examiner. beyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). approved b) disapproved by the Examiner. c. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). pplication No received in this National Stage
8)	Claims tion Papers The specification is objected to by the Examiner. The drawing(s) filed on	are subject a a) accepted or becoming(s) be held in able is: a) to this Office action. iner. riority under 35 U.S.Core been received. re been received in Approximate the procuments have been au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)) re certified copies not	ct to restriction and/or election requirement. a) objected to by the Examiner. beyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). approved b) disapproved by the Examiner. c. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). pplication No. received in this National Stage received.
8)	Claims tion Papers The specification is objected to by the Examiner. The drawing(s) filed on	are subject and accepted or becoming a language and accepted or becoming a language and are subject are subject	ct to restriction and/or election requirement. a) objected to by the Examiner. beyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). approved b) disapproved by the Examiner c. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). pplication No received in this National Stage c. c. § 119(e).
8)	Claims tion Papers The specification is objected to by the Examiner. The drawing(s) filed on	are subject a a) accepted or bect awing(s) be held in about is: a) to this Office action. iner. riority under 35 U.S.Core been received. re been received in Approximate the procuments have been au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)) re certified copies not priority under 35 U.S.Core priority under 35	ct to restriction and/or election requirement. a) objected to by the Examiner. beyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). approved b) disapproved by the Examiner c. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). pplication No. received in this National Stage received. c. C. § 119(e). received.
8)	Claims The specification is objected to by the Examiner. The drawing(s) filed on	are subject a a) accepted or bect awing(s) be held in about is: a) to this Office action. iner. riority under 35 U.S.Core been received. re been received in Approximate the procuments have been au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)) re certified copies not priority under 35 U.S.Core priority under 35	ct to restriction and/or election requirement. a) objected to by the Examiner. beyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). approved b) disapproved by the Examiner c. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). pplication No. received in this National Stage received. c. C. § 119(e). received.
8)	Claims The specification is objected to by the Examiner. The drawing(s) filed on	are subject and accepted or bedrawing(s) be held in abservation. are subject briant are subject are subj	ct to restriction and/or election requirement. a) objected to by the Examiner. beyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). approved b) disapproved by the Examiner c. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). pplication No. received in this National Stage received. c. C. § 119(e). received.
8)	Claims The specification is objected to by the Examiner. The drawing(s) filed on	are subject and accepted or bedrawing(s) be held in abservation. are subject briant are subject are subj	ot to restriction and/or election requirement. O) objected to by the Examiner. Devance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Deproved b) disapproved by the Examiner C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). Deplication No.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 45,46,48,49 and 51-65 are rejected under 35
 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Sasaki</u> (U.S. 5,228,118)
 in view of <u>Gase et al</u> (U.S. 5,580,177).

As to claim 45, <u>Sasaki</u> discloses an information processing apparatus comprising: an inquirer adapted (see figures 1-2: inquiring means) for making an inquiry about a printer language supported by the printer (see figures 1 and 2) connected to the network by sending an inquiry about information to the network (reads on col. 9, lines 53-65); and a receiver (see column 2, line 60 to column 3, line 13) adapted for receiving information about the printer language supported by the printer, wherein the information about the printer language is sent in response to the inquiry (see column 2, line 60 through column 3, line 13). <u>Sasaki</u> discloses changing of the printer from one type to another (see column 2, lines 3-4 and 49-50), and sending a broadcast inquiry

Serial Number: 09/503,482 Art Unit: 2624 to the printer(s) connected to the network (reads on col. 9, lines 53-65).

Sasaki does not teach a determiner adapted for determining a presence or an absence of a printer connected to a network by inquiring information of the network. Sasaki does not specify making an inquiry about a printer language supported by the printer connected to the network if the determiner determines the presence of the printer connected to the network.

Gase et al teaches a printing network having a plurality of clients (10, 12 and 14) connected to a server (16), and the server (16) is further connected to a plurality of printers (18, 20 and 22) (see figure 1). Gase et al teaches a determiner adapted to send an inquiry about information to a network in order to determine a presence or an absence of a printer connected to the network (see col. 1, lines 43-48, col. 4, lines 35-37, and col. 5. Line 64 thru col. 6, line 17); and making an inquiry about a printer language supported by the new added printer connected to the network if the determiner determines the presence of the new added printer connected to the network, a new printer driver must be installed on the client host computer, so that the client will be able to use or print on the newly added printer) (see col. 1, lines 43-48 and col. 6, lines 3-17).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one person having

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified <u>Sasaki</u> wherein: the information processing apparatus includes a determiner adapted for determining a presence or an absence of a printer connected to a network by sending an inquiry, and wherein the inquiry circuit is adapted for making an inquiry about a printer language supported by the printer connected to the network if the determination circuit determines the presence of the printer is connected to the network.

It would have been obvious to one person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified network printing system of <u>Sasaki</u> by the teaching of <u>Gase et al</u> because of the following reason(s): (1) for the reasons taught by Gase et al (see column 1, lines 43-48 and col. 4, lines 35-37); and (2) to determine when a newly added printer is added or connected to the network, so that the network or the clients or the users, will be aware of the newly added or connected printer, and to inquire as to what kind of printer languages are supported by the newly added printer, therefore, the users or clients will be able to use or employ the newly added or connected printer.

As to claim 46, <u>Sasaki</u> as modified discloses wherein the determiner determines a presence or an absence of a new printer connected to the network by inquiring about management

information base information to the network (see Gase et al, see column 1, lines 43-48).

As to claims 48-49, <u>Sasaki</u> discloses an information processing method. The steps of method claims 48-49 claim subject matter corresponding to and similar to the claimed limitations that are found in the information processing apparatus claims of claims 45-46. Therefore, claims 48-49 are similarly rejected.

As to claims 51-53, <u>Sasaki</u> discloses a computer-readable storage medium for storing a program for implementing an information processing method. The program codes of the computer-readable storage medium of claims 51-53 claim subject matter corresponding to and similar to the claimed limitations that are found in the information processing apparatus claims of claims 45-47. Therefore, claims 51-53 are similarly rejected.

As to claims 54-55, <u>Gase et al</u> teaches a determiner adapted for determining a presence or an absence of a printer connected to a network periodically or to a user's instruction (see column 1, lines 43-64, the user has to send the inquiry by running the NetWare software, which can be run periodically). Therefore, It would have been obvious to one person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified <u>Sasaki</u> by the teaching of <u>Gase et al</u> because of the following reason(s): (1) for the reasons taught by Gase et al (see column

1, lines 43-48); and (2) to determine when a newly added printer is added or connected to the network, so that the network or the clients or the users, will be aware of the newly added or connected printer, and to inquire as to what kind of printer languages are supported by the newly added printer, therefore, the users or clients will be able to use or employ the newly added or connected printer.

As to claims 56-57, <u>Sasaki</u> discloses wherein the printer language is used to represent a print job, and the print data is converted according to the printer language supported by the printer, so that the printer can interpret the print data (i.e. col. 6, lines 46-65).

As to claims 58-61, <u>Sasaki</u> discloses an information processing method. The steps of method claims 58-61 claim subject matter corresponding to and similar to the claimed limitations that are found in the information processing apparatus claims of claims 54-57. Therefore, claims 58-61 are similarly rejected.

As to claims 62-65, <u>Sasaki</u> discloses a computer-readable storage medium for storing a program for implementing an information processing method. The program codes of the computer-readable storage medium of claims 62-65 claim subject matter corresponding to and similar to the claimed limitations that are found in the information processing apparatus claims of claims 54-57. Therefore, claims 62-65 are similarly rejected.

Conclusion

3. Applicant's arguments filed 2/5/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). (see details above).

In response to Applicant's argument that Gase et al. Fails to teach or suggest an inquiry about information to a network a presence or an absence of a printer connected to the network. Examiner disagrees with Applicant's conclusion, Examiner asserts that Gase et al. teaches the printer availability is periodically advertised so that a client computer may be informed of the availability, but also teaches actively sending an inquiry about information to a network to determine a presence or an absence of a printer connected to the network (see col. 4, lines 35-37 and col. 5, which describe how an inquiry is send to the printer(s) to determine the presence or absence of the printer by being disconnected, or finding the state of the printer (active or inactive).

4. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gabriel I. Garcia whose telephone number is (703) 305-8751.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks Washington, DC 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314

Gabriel I. Garcia Primary Examiner May 18, 2003

GABRIEL GARCIA PRIMARY EXAMINER